



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,214	05/31/2002	Masaru Yasui	PHJ 99-026	8898
24737	7590	05/10/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			NATNAEL, PAULOS M	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2622	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/890,214	YASUI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paulos M. Natnael	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 5-7,9,13 and 15 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,8,10 and 14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 4,11 and 12 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Final Rejection mailed on February 22, 2006 has been withdrawn.
2. Per Examiner conversation over the phone with the applicant's representative, Ken Springer, this office action corrects a couple of inadvertent errors. Claim 15 was rejected in the prior office action. Since claim 15 depends from claim 9, which has been indicated allowable over the prior art, claim 15 is also allowable over the prior art.
3. In response to applicant's demand for evidence for the taking of official notice by the examiner in the previous office action, a rejection based on Hashimoto in view of Yoshida (a newly cited reference) has been made as shown below. And according to MPEP, the office action is made final as well. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1,3,8,10 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al. U.S. 6,072,457.

Considering claim 1, Hashimoto et al (hereinafter, Hashimoto) discloses a display and driving method comprising at least two line memories (100-2, 100-1, fig.2) a control circuit 140 and at least a couple of signal processors, 120-1 and 120-2. On col. 11, line 45 thru col. 12, line 10 and referring to Figure 15, Hashimoto teaches that "The writing into and the reading from the line memory are performed in the following order. First, upon a start signal 26 of the shift register 4 at the writing side, the shift register 4 starts the operation, making sampling 1200 times during one horizontal scan period, and sequentially writing into the line memory. At the time when the sampling (600+6) times or more is ended, upon a start signal 28 of the shift register 18 at the reading side, the operation of the shift register 18 if started, so that data at the odd address is read in the order of 1, 3, 5 addresses (Ro1, Go1, Bo1), and 7, 9, 11 addresses (Ro2, Go2, Bo2) of the line memory, three data at the same time. If the frequency of read clock at this time is three times that of the write clock, the reading up to the (1200-6)-th address has been performed at the time when the writing into the line memory is ended, whereby the reading is not performed before the writing into the line memory. Also, the reading is performed within $t_{sub}H / 2$ which is half one horizontal scan period $t_{sub}H$, while the writing into the first row of the liquid crystal panel is ended. During the next $t_{sub}H / 2$ period, data at the even address is read, three data at the same time, in the order of 2, 4, 6 addresses (Be1, Re1, Ge1), 8, 10, 12 addresses (Be2, Re2, Ge2), . . . in the same

manner as above described. Then, the sampling of image signal for the next horizontal scan period is performed, and data is written into the line memory, but the order of the writing and reading is not reversed if the reading precedes the writing. Where the reading of data is performed after the end of the writing into the line memory, a line memory for the image signal during two horizontal scan periods is required, but by reading the image signal data from the line memory while writing into the same line memory, as in this example, the line memory can be halved." [emphasis added by examiner] Thus, the claimed subject matter in claim 1 is met by the disclosure of Hashimoto as shown above.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, see rejection of claim 1 and the display and driving methods of Hashimoto illustrated therein.

As to claim 8, see rejection of claim 1;

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2622

7. Claims 2,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto, U.S. 6,072457 in view of Yoshida, U.S. 5,168,362.

Considering claims 2 and 14, Hashimoto discloses line memories without specifying whether the line memories would also be dual port and/or FIFOs. However, the examiner submits that dual port memories using FIFOs are notoriously well known in the art. In that regard, Yoshida teaches an apparatus for displaying standard aspect ratio television signal on wide aspect ratio display screen. Fig.6 of Yoshida discloses a converter circuit comprising a dual port line memory 23, which is also a FIFO type memory. See col. 7, lines 23-26. It would have been therefore obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reference of Hashimoto by providing a line memory that is a dual port FIFO such as that taught by Yoshida in order for the writing and reading of video information to and from the memory is made more efficient (i.e., improved transfer rate, processing time, etc.) as is notoriously well known in the art of television or video signal conversion or interpolation of the same.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 11-14-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the quoted passage (col. 11, line 45 thru col. 12, line 10) only discloses one line memory and thus, the applicant asserts, the reference does not teach two line memories as claimed.

Contrary to the Applicant's assertion, however, the reference of "Hashimoto" teaches on col. 12, starting on line 5, "Where the reading of data is performed after the end of the writing into the line memory, a line memory for the image signal during two horizontal scan periods is required, but by reading the image signal data from the line memory while writing into the same line memory, as in this example, the line memory can be halved." Clearly, since both writing and reading from the same memory simultaneously would be difficult to do, Hashimoto suggests a solution and the line memory can be halved, yielding, as it were, two line memories. Thus, the disclosure of Hashimoto as a whole meets the claim as claimed.

9. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as applicant demands the examiner provide an affidavit for the notoriously well known subject matter, examiner has provide a reference as shown in the rejection of claims 2 and 14 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 5-7,9,13,15 are allowable over the prior art.
11. Claims 4,11-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paulos M. Natnael whose telephone number is (571) 272-7354. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm M,W, F (7am-3:30pm T,Th).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571)272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Paulos M. Natnael
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622/

PMN
May 4, 2006